

R E M A R K S

Careful review and examination of the subject application are noted and appreciated.

SUPPORT FOR THE CLAIM AMENDMENTS

Support for the claim amendments may be found in the specification, for example, in paragraphs 0029, 0039-0042, 0048, 0052, 0066, 0087, 00104, 00107 and FIGS. 1-4, 6, 11-13 and 19, as originally filed. Thus, no new matter has been added.

INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

Applicants' representative plans to re-submit the references that were objected to in another communication.

DRAWINGS

The drawings have been amended to obviate the objection. The original FIGS. 24, 29 and 31 have been deleted and FIGS. 25-28 and 30 have been renumbered accordingly as instructed by the Office. As such, the objection to the drawings should be withdrawn.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §101

The rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §101 has been obviated by appropriate amendment and should be withdrawn.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §112

The rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, has been obviated by appropriate amendment and should be withdrawn.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102

The rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102 as being anticipated by Schneider '044 has been obviated by appropriate amendment and should be withdrawn.

The rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Dunning '756 has been obviated by appropriate amendment and should be withdrawn.

The rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Iliff '456 has been obviated by appropriate amendment and should be withdrawn.

The rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Brown '095 has been obviated by appropriate amendment and should be withdrawn.

Schneider concerns an apparatus and method of determining fertility status (Title). Dunning concerns a remote pulmonary function tester (Title). Iliff concerns a computerized medical diagnostic system utilizing list-based processing (Title). Brown concerns treatment regimen compliance and efficacy with feedback (Title).

Claim 1 provides a second server including a feedback engine configured to (i) receive one or more responses via a network from each of one or more selected devices, (ii) generate feedback data by processing the responses and (iii) update an information base with the feedback data. In contrast, the rejections of claim 1 only mention "feedback from a patient". Nothing in the rejection identifies elements of the references allegedly similar to the claimed feedback engine. Therefore, *prima facie* anticipation has not been established for a lack of evidence that the references disclose or suggest all of the claim limitations as arranged in the claims. As such, the rejections of claim 1 should be withdrawn.

New claims 11 and 20 provide language similar to claim 1. As such, claims 11 and 20 are also fully patentable over the cited references and should be allowed.

New claims 2-10 and 12-19 depend from claims 1 and 11, which are now believed to be allowable. As such, the dependent claims are fully patentable over the cited references and should be allowed.

Accordingly, the present application is in condition for allowance. Early and favorable action by the Examiner is respectfully solicited.

The Examiner is respectfully invited to call the Applicants' representative at 586-498-0670 should it be deemed beneficial to further advance prosecution of the application.

If any additional fees are due, please charge Deposit Account No. 50-0541.

Respectfully submitted,

CHRISTOPHER P. MAIORANA, P.C.



Christopher P. Maiorana
Registration No. 42,829

Dated: January 26, 2007

c/o Sandeep Jaggi
Health Hero Network
2000 Seaport Blvd., Ste. 400
Redwood City, CA 94063

Docket No.: 04-0420 / 7553.00060